

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-26, 28-38 and 40 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,173,317 to Chaddha et al. (hereinafter Chaddha) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,630,963 to Billmaier (hereinafter Billmaier). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As explained in the response filed on November 21, 2005, Applicants claim methods and systems for synchronizing a program signal with a vector graphic animation movie. The claimed methods include receiving a programming signal and a vector graphic animation movie at a client device. Once the vector graphic animation movie is received it is loaded on the client device. Finally, a command is sent from a server to the client device to synchronize the playback of the vector graphic animation movie on the client device. Accordingly, the command is sent to the control the playback of the vector graphic animation movie already on the client device.

As described in column 5, lines 18-55, Chaddha describes a system in which each annotation frame includes ticker data and an event time marker. The time markers in the annotation streams apparently can be used by the client device to synchronize the annotations with the video stream. However, the time markers are part of the annotation frames themselves. Accordingly, since the time markers are sent simultaneously with the annotations, they do not control the playback of a movie already on the client device as claimed.

In advisory action dated December 15, 2005, the Examiner states the response filed on November 15, 2005, did not overcome the rejections over Chaddha because the Examiner does not believe that the claims specify that the command sent from the server to the client device to synchronize the playback of the vector graphic animation movie is sent at a different time than the vector animation movie.

All of the pending independent claims have been amended to specify that the command is sent after the vector animation movie is retrieved by the client device. Since, as previously explained, Chaddha and Billmaier fail to disclose or suggest this claimed aspect of the invention, the rejection of claims 1-26, 28-38 and 40, should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below.

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 03-1952 referencing Attorney Docket No. 559442001900.

Dated: January 13, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By

Jonathan Bockman

Registration No.: 45,640  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
1650 Tysons Blvd, Suite 300  
McLean, Virginia 22102  
(703) 760-7769